
REMARKS

Applicant has rewritten the claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctively so as to overcome the rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

Claim rejection under § 112

The claims, including claims 1 and 19, were objected to under § 112 since they were said to fail to clearly define the scope of the limitation: "not processed information."

The claims were rewritten. "Processed information" is now described as information that overlaps from a first portion of window related information (i.e., the portion displayed before scrolling). This definition clearly defines the scope of the limitation. And it has clear antecedents in the specification, e.g.: "Information that overlaps from a previous view is not always "old", that is, effectively processed by a user." (page 11 of the original application).

Accordingly, "not processed information" is described as information that does *not* overlap from a first portion.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-20, 24-28 on Watson and Bates is overcome

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-20, 24-28 as being unpatentable over US patent application publication 2002/0126154 (Watson), in view of US patent 5,973,663 (Bates et al). Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-20, 24-28 have been rewritten to define patentability over these references, and any combination thereof. Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection, as now applicable to revised claims, for the following reasons:

(a) Claims 1 and 19: A modification, not taught in the prior art, is necessary to combine Watson and Bates.

(b) The effective date of applicant's invention is prior to the filing date of US patent application publication 2002/0126154 (Watson).

(d) Neither Watson nor Bates show the novel feature of claim 3, which feature produces new and significant results.

Claims 1 and 19: A modification, not taught in the prior art, is necessary to combine Watson and Bates.

When rejecting claims 1 and 19 the Office Action of 12/29/05 states:

"Watson is silent regarding disabling the visual clues after a predetermined amount of time. However, in the same field of document viewing, Bates teaches the disabling visual clues after a predetermined amount of time (see description of figures 2,3). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to combine Bates' teaching of disabling the visual clues after a predetermined amount of time to Watson. Motivation of the combining is resetting the display control once the clues are no longer needed." (Office Action of 12/29/05, page 3)

Applicant respectfully disagrees that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to combine Bates' teaching of disabling the visual clues after a predetermined amount of time to Watson. First of all, here is no justification, in Watson and Bates, or in any other prior art, which suggests that these references be combined, much less in the manner proposed. More specific reasons are as follows:

- (a) Bates only discloses visual clues *displayed in a scroll bar area*. This clearly differentiates it from both applicant and Watson, who disclose visual clues *displayed in the content of a window* (e.g., a document).
- (b) Bates describes visual clues -- marking a certain portion of a document in the scroll bar area -- that are generally the *more salient* the longer the portion remains displayed in a window (and becoming gradually less salient when another portion is displayed). By contrast, the present invention teaches visual clues that are *disabled* when a portion of a document remains displayed in a window.

In sum, applicant's invention that teaches visual clues in a visible portion of a document, which clues disappear when the portion remains displayed in the window, is very different from Bates' teaching of visual clues in the scroll bar area, which clues generally increase in intensity when the portion remains displayed in the window. The differences are both functional and structural. It can be concluded that Bates cannot be combined with Watson to produce applicant's invention without an unobvious modification not taught in the prior art (if at all).

Therefore, the novel feature of claims 1 and 19 of the present invention is unobvious and patentable over the cited references.

The effective date of applicant's invention is prior to the filing date of US patent application publication 2002/0126154 (Watson).

Watson (US patent application 2002/0126154) has the filing date of **March 13, 2001**.

The effective date for the present invention is prior to that date. On **July 13, 2000** applicant filed a description of the present invention with the USPTO Disclosure Document Program ("(#476843, entitled "Transient visual clues for scrolling"). The filing was diligently followed by building and testing the invention. The DDP description clearly identifies the main features of the invention: (a) visual clues separating old and new information after scrolling, and (b) disabling the clues shortly after scrolling:

The preferred embodiment of the invention are standard scroll windows that after scrolling temporarily show the "carry over" from the old view on a visually different background. Figure 1 shows how the last line of a text window (Fig. 1a), which is repeated in the view that the user has after scrolling, is highlighted immediately after scrolling (Fig. 2b), but this highlighting shortly disappears (Fig. 1c). The same principle applies when the user scrolls by small incremental steps (one or few lines) or backwards (see Fig. 2a, 2b). (DDP 476843, July 13, 2000)

Applicant does not know the effective date of Watson. In particular, applicant does not know if Watson disclosed disabling visual clues after scrolling at an earlier date than July 13, 2000. If, for instance, Watson did not disclose *disabling visual clues after scrolling* before July 13, 2000, applicant respectfully submits that Watson cannot be used as a prior art for the present invention.

Neither Watson nor Bates show the novel feature of claim 3, which feature produces new and significant results.

When rejecting claims 3, 11, 19, 20, 27 the Office Action of 12/29/05 states:

"As for claims 3, 11, 19, 20, 27: Bates teaches the visual clue is disabled before a first predetermined amount of time, and become apparent after a second predetermined time (4:51-54)" (Office Action of 12/29/05, page 3)

The amended claim 3 is presented below (in combination with amended claim 1, which is provided for better understanding of the subject matter of claim 3):

Claim 1. A method of displaying information in a window on a computer system including a display, said window displaying only part of its related information, the method comprising:

- providing a window for displaying information; further comprising the step of
- providing means for scrolling the window; and
- displaying in the window a first portion of its related information; and
- scrolling the window to a second portion of its related information, further comprising the step of

- causing visual clues, visually distinguishing information that overlaps from said first portion and new information that does not overlap from said first portion, to be displayed in the window so that said distinguishing visual clues do not obstruct the view of said new information; and

disabling the distinguishing visual clues after a first predetermined amount of time.

Claim 3. The method of claim 1, wherein:

- the distinguishing visual clues are displayed in the window after scrolling if and only if the first portion of window's related information has been displayed in the window before scrolling for more then a second predetermined amount of time.

Claim 3 teaches displaying distinguishing visual clues after scrolling if and only if the portion of the document displayed before scrolling has been displayed for at least a second predetermined amount of time. This feature does not have analogies in either Watson or Bates.

The closest feature is Bates' "sampling rate" referred to in the OA of 12/29/05 (page 3). However, this feature is very different from claim 3. First, as already mentioned, Bates teaches visual clues in a scroll bar area. Second, the dynamics of the clues as determined by "sampling rate" is completely different, as shown in a

table below. The table described a simplified dynamics of visual clues when a portion of a document is displayed in a window for, respectively, present invention's or Bates' predetermined amounts of time (step 1), longer time (step 2), immediately after scrolling (step 3), and some time after scrolling (step 4). It is obvious that Bates' feature is completely different from the present invention: in a way, even opposite.

Table 1. TVC (present invention) vs Bates

	TVC	Bates
<i>Predetermined amount of time</i>	<i>Second predetermined amount of time (e.g., 1.5 sec)</i>	<i>First sampling rate (e.g., 20 sec)</i>
Step 1. First portion of the document is displayed for a predetermined amount of time	NO visual clues are displayed in the window	VISUAL CLUES: a region corresponding to the first portion is created and displayed in the scroll bar area
Step 2. First portion of the document is displayed for a longer period of time	NO visual clues are displayed in the window	VISUAL CLUES: the region "warms up"
Step 3. The document is scrolled to a second portion	VISUAL CLUES are displayed to distinguish new information and information that overlaps from the first portion	NO visual clues corresponding to the second portion are displayed in the scroll bar area
Step 4. Second portion of the document is displayed for a predetermined amount of time	NO visual clues are displayed in the displayed portion	VISUAL CLUES: a region corresponding to the second portion is created and displayed in the scroll bar area

Not only is Claim 3 completely different from Watson and Bates, it also produces a new and significant result.

The proposed method eliminates presentation of incorrect and potentially confusing visual clues when the user carries out a quick succession of scrolling commands. For instance, if the user scrolls three pages down, one page immediately after another, the third (last) page will only display new information, even if there is an overlap from the second page. No visual clues will be needed in this case, and claim 3 will assure that no clues be displayed, since the second page is not displayed for more than the second predetermined amount of time (e.g., 1.5 sec).

Neither Watson nor Bates produces the above result. Watson does not teach a feature similar to claim 3. Bates supports finding already displayed information within a whole document, by using visual representations on a scroll bar. Neither of them (or any combination of them) can prevent displaying incorrect visual clues when the time during which information is displayed before scrolling is too short for the user to read it.

Therefore, the novel feature of claim 3 is unobvious and patentable over these references.

A response to claim rejections of dependent claims

In the sections above applicant provides responses to claim rejections of independent claims (claims 1 and 19) and one dependent claim (claim 3). The present section provides detailed responses to claim rejections of other dependent claims (OA of 12/29/06, pages 3-5). Before proceeding to detailed responses, applicant submits that revised dependent claims incorporate all the subject matter of claims 1, 3, and 19, and add additional subject matter, which makes them a fortiori and independently patentable over Watson and Bates.

a. "As for claim 4: In light of the combining, the processed and unprocessed information have different display attributes, which is accomplished by changing the display attributes of their foreground and background (Watson's figure 1)"

As shown above in the discussion of independent claims, the present invention uses display attributes differently than Watson or Bates. Applicant submits that revised

dependent claim 4 incorporates all the subject matter of claims 1 and 3 and adds additional subject matter, which makes it patentable over Watson and Bates.

b. "As for claims 5-7: The visual clues changes with time and the degree of user interaction (see Bates' description of figure 2)"

As shown above in the discussion of independent claims, the present invention is different from Bates, and it uses dynamic visual clues to accomplish different results. Applicant submits that revised dependent claims 5-7 incorporate all the subject matter of claims 1 and 3 and add additional subject matter, which makes them patentable over Bates.

c. "As for claim 8: In light of the combining, processed information portions are separated from unprocessed information portions by the highlighted (Watson's fig 11)."

Claim 8 is cancelled.

d. "As for claim 9: In light of the combining, the displayed information are marked by highlight marker on the information itself and a marker 35-37 on the scrollbar."

Claim 9 is cancelled.

e. "As for claim 24: The markers are displayed responsive to detected scrolling input event, direction, scrolling increment. The location of the markers in the scrollbar and in the scrollbar slider provide a direction toward marked and unmarked portions of information."

The present invention aims at directing attention to areas of information displayed in a window, not to different portions of a document as a whole. Therefore, using markers in the scrollbar and in the scrollbar slider cannot accomplish the aims of the present invention. Applicant submits that dependent claim 24 incorporates all the subject matter of claim 19 and adds additional subject matter, which makes it patentable over prior art.

f. As for claim 14: In light of the combining, the displayed portion is defined as an effective rectangle area bordered by the window boundary.”

In the context of the present invention the effective area can be defined as any rectangle within the window area, and therefore can be different from the window boundary. This differentiates the invention from the prior art (see more on pp. 11-12 of the unamended application). Applicant submits that dependent claim 14 incorporates all the subject matter of claims 1 and 3 and adds additional subject matter, which makes it patentable over prior art.

g. “As for claim 15: It is inherently included that Watson and Bates’ teaching of scrolling that the document can be scrolled in line-by-line increment toward the top or bottom of the window, wherein the Y coordinate of the screen pointer is equal to the Y coordinate of the bottom/top of the effective area.”

Neither Watson nor Bates teach an effective area that can be different from the window boundary (see (f) above). Therefore, claim 15 that incorporates all the subject matter of claim 14 adds additional subject matter, is novel and patentable over prior art.

h. “As for claims 16, 25: A new displayed portion of the document can be defined as effective are be default and marked. It is also inherently included that the user may define an effective area by using cursor input device.”

Applicant submits that dependent claim 16 incorporates all the subject matter of claims 1, 3, and 14 and adds additional subject matter, which makes it patentable over prior art. Claim 25 is cancelled.

i. “As for claims 17, 26: The user may specify the parameter of the visual clues. The parameters include time threshold, display attributes, etc. (Bates’ 5:65-6:40)”

As shown above in the discussion of independent claims, the present invention is different from Bates, and it uses specifying parameters of visual clues to accomplish different results. Applicant submits that revised dependent claims 17 and 26

incorporate all the subject matter of, respectively, claim 1 and 3 and claim 19, and add additional subject matter, which makes them patentable over prior art.

J. "As for claim 18: The window is resizable. It is inherently included that the markers remain after the window is resized."

Resizing a window may result in displaying a new portion of information. Claim 18 discloses visual clues that distinguish new information displayed AFTER resizing from "old" information, also displayed in the window BEFORE resizing. Therefore, claim 18 incorporates all the subject matter of claims 1 and 3 and adds additional subject matter, which makes it patentable over prior art.

k. "As for claim 28: The visual clues are enabled when the second portion is the last portion of the window related information (0015)."

Claim 28 discloses visual clues that are enabled ONLY when the second portion is the last portion of the window related information. This is a novel feature that makes that claim patentable over prior art.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore he submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

Conditional request for constructive assistance

Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to MPEP § 706.03(d) and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned

Kaptelinin

Amendment D

Page 18 of 18

can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,



Viktor Kaptelinin

Applicant Pro Se

Mariehemsv. 13A
906 54 Umeå, Sweden
Tel. +46-90-786 5927
Fax +46-90-786 6550

Certificate of mailing: I certify that on the date below I will fax this document and references attachments, if any, to the Patent and Trademark Office at the following number: **(571) 273-8300**

Date: April 29, 2006

Inventor's signature: 